

2005 NAIP Survey
Executive Summary
For
Oregon

USDA
Farm Service Agency

Aerial Photography Field Office

March 2006

Contents

Section	Pages
1.0 Introduction	3
1.1 Purpose and Scope	
1.2 Survey Submittals	
2.0 Qualitative Evaluation Summary	4-5
Executive Summary Supplemental Documents (Detached):	
Executive Summary Supplemental 1 – NAIP Survey Text Comments for Question 13 (MS Word)	
Executive Summary Supplemental 2 – NAIP Survey Text Comments for Question 14 (MS Word)	

Section 1

1.0 Introduction

The primary purpose of NAIP is to acquire peak growing season “leaf on” imagery, and deliver this imagery to United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) County Service Centers in order to maintain Common Land Unit (CLU) boundaries and assist with crop compliance and a multitude of other farm programs.

As evidenced by the types of customers requesting NAIP imagery, the imagery has other purposes as well. Although our primary customers are States and County Service Centers, other uses for NAIP imagery, including military, real estate, recreation, planning, etc., cannot be overlooked.

NAIP is a program with a relatively short history, beginning with pilot projects in 2001 and 2002, and moving to full volume acquisition in 2003 to 2005, based on funding and partnering. NAIP is moving out of the research and development phase and into sustainment status. By moving into a sustainment phase, a program can build and evaluate a quality business process, and stabilize. Part of this process is evaluating how NAIP is working for its primary customers.

1.1 Purpose and Scope

The focus of this document is to assess in a qualitative manner how NAIP is satisfying customer needs in Oregon. In other words, “How did APFO do in providing *useful* NAIP imagery for its primary customer?” Answering this question comprises the purpose and scope.

1.2 Survey Submittals

For the initial disposition, the following States were sent surveys to disseminate to County Service Centers for completion: WA, **OR**, OK, KS, NE, MO, IA, MN, WI, IL, IN, OH, CT, and NC. No responses were received from KS or AZ by the 15 Dec 2005 due date. WA noted that they would respond to the survey, but due to imagery delivery/redelivery dates, responses would likely be after 15 Dec.

A second waive of surveys was sent to the following States to disseminate to County Service Centers for completion: CA, CO, MT, ND, SD, TX, LA, MS, AL, GA, FL, SC, VA, MD, PA, MI, RI, and CT. Responses were requested by 17 Feb, and by 9 Mar for select states which received imagery “late”. Surveys were accidentally sent to CT twice, however, County Service Centers only responded once. LA noted that they would only be able to get a few Counties to complete the survey by the 9 Mar due date. MI noted they would not be able to participate in the survey because of CIR rework that would be completed after the survey due date. MT noted that due to the late distribution of imagery, surveys would likely be returned after the 9 Mar due date. During the second waive of surveys, no survey responses were received by CO, GA, MI, or AL. Surveys received after 9 Mar 06 were not scored.

Section 2

2.0 Qualitative Evaluation Summary

NAIP Assessment Surveys were provided by email to County Service Centers via the State Office and responses were requested by 15 Dec 05. Out of the responses received, in Oregon, 633 of a possible 750 points were achieved, for a weighted average score out of 1.0 of .844, for a rating of 84.4%. Translated into survey terms, this is an overall rating of “Satisfied”. The map on the following page graphically represents overall survey results by county. These results indicate that generally the counties that participated in the survey were satisfied with 2005 NAIP and that the products met customer needs most of the time. However, there is room for improvement.

Most textual comments from the survey revolved around timing of imagery acquisition and delivery. Textual comments can be found in the Executive Summary Supplementals 1 and 2. A statistical summary by question of survey results is shown below. Note that Q1-8 are out of a possible 5 points and Q9-10 are out of a possible 10 points. Statistically, the lowest average scoring question was Q7, “Is the imagery useful for government coordination, for example, in communications with other Federal, State or local agencies?” Statistically, the highest scoring questions were Q4 and Q6, “Is the imagery useful for CLU maintenance?” and “Is the imagery useful for measurement services?” respectively.

Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q5	
Mean	3.846153846	Mean	4.307692308	Mean	4.363636364	Mean	4.692307692	Mean	4.25
Standard Error	0.273771237	Standard Error	0.237092846	Standard Error	0.203278907	Standard Error	0.133234678	Standard Error	0.21759707
Median	4	Median	5	Median	4	Median	5	Median	4
Mode	5	Mode	5	Mode	5	Mode	5	Mode	5
Standard Deviation	0.987096234	Standard Deviation	0.854850414	Standard Deviation	0.674199862	Standard Deviation	0.480384461	Standard Deviation	0.753778361
Sample Variance	0.974358974	Sample Variance	0.730769231	Sample Variance	0.454545455	Sample Variance	0.230769231	Sample Variance	0.568181818
Kurtosis	-0.912389826	Kurtosis	-1.240090657	Kurtosis	-0.293333333	Kurtosis	-1.339393939	Kurtosis	-0.868266667
Skewness	-0.261750777	Skewness	-0.705235446	Skewness	-0.593295879	Skewness	-0.946211818	Skewness	-0.47759397
Range	3	Range	2	Range	2	Range	1	Range	2
Minimum	2	Minimum	3	Minimum	3	Minimum	4	Minimum	3
Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5
Sum	50	Sum	56	Sum	48	Sum	61	Sum	51
Count	13	Count	13	Count	11	Count	13	Count	12
Q6		Q7		Q8		Q9_X2		Q10_X2	
Mean	4.692307692	Mean	3.818181818	Mean	4	Mean	8.769230769	Mean	7.846153846
Standard Error	0.133234678	Standard Error	0.325246251	Standard Error	0.275240941	Standard Error	0.280883363	Standard Error	0.529224806
Median	5	Median	4	Median	4	Median	8	Median	8
Mode	5	Mode	5	Mode	4	Mode	8	Mode	8
Standard Deviation	0.480384461	Standard Deviation	1.07871978	Standard Deviation	0.953462589	Standard Deviation	1.012739367	Standard Deviation	1.908147175
Sample Variance	0.230769231	Sample Variance	1.163636364	Sample Variance	0.909090909	Sample Variance	1.025641026	Sample Variance	3.641025641
Kurtosis	-1.339393939	Kurtosis	-1.387532552	Kurtosis	0.161333333	Kurtosis	-2.056363636	Kurtosis	1.296084832
Skewness	-0.946211818	Skewness	-0.154504135	Skewness	-0.755142371	Skewness	0.538593209	Skewness	-1.187709865
Range	1	Range	3	Range	3	Range	2	Range	6
Minimum	4	Minimum	2	Minimum	2	Minimum	8	Minimum	4
Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	10	Maximum	10
Sum	61	Sum	42	Sum	48	Sum	114	Sum	102
Count	13	Count	11	Count	12	Count	13	Count	13

2005 NAIP - Overall Qualitative Survey Results

